

THE JOURNAL

W. R. HEARST.

162 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK.

TUESDAY, JUNE 30, 1896.

Entered in the Post Office in New York as second class matter.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month.....\$4.50
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year.....\$50.00
 DAILY, Without Sunday, Per Month.....\$3.50
 DAILY, Without Sunday, Per Year.....\$42.00
 SUNDAY, Alone, Per Year.....\$12.00
 Three times the above rates in all foreign countries, except Mexico and Canada.
 All money remitted at risk of sender.
 In order to secure attention, subscribers wishing their addresses changed must give their old as well as new address.
 IN ENGLAND The Journal can be purchased at the office of the International Publishing Company, Trafalgar Buildings, No. 1, Northumberland Avenue, London, E. C. 4. Also from Smith, Stanley & Co., 25, Old Broad Street, Strand, London, W. C.

Journal readers will confer a favor upon the publisher if they will send information to this office of any news stand, railway train or passenger steamboat where a New York paper should be on sale and the Journal is not offered.

THE WEATHER.

Official forecasts for to-day indicate that it will be fair.

Will Mr. Hanna offer Mr. Platt a drink out of that loving cup?

Thurston says that the tariff is the great issue. That makes three men who hold that view. Hanna and McKinley have thought so all along.

A woman whose husband has just been killed in her presence might be excused for showing some agitation, even by the fastidious standards of a police court.

The sound money Democrats may be helpless at Chicago, but there are over a hundred Representatives in Congress to be elected from the Northeastern States. That ought to furnish them a little occupation.

With six, and perhaps ten, Massachusetts delegates preparing to vote for free silver at Chicago, the home missionary field seems to offer all needed opportunities for the activity of Eastern sound money men.

It's a mighty good thing for Major McKinley that the scientific burglars who robbed Mark Hanna's house of \$500 worth of property Friday night were not at St. Louis. Suppose they had gone after those Southern delegates.

The life insurance companies are said to be paying out enormous sums just now in settlement of suicide claims. Here is a suggestion for the Democracy. If the party is really to commit suicide, it might as well take out a policy and make a little money out of it.

The London Times, with that accurate appreciation of the niceties of American politics for which the English press is distinguished, fears that "it is not certain that Mr. McKinley will oppose the popular will if Congress should send him a bill for free silver," because "when the President is elected he becomes a free agent in a safer and stronger position than an English Premier." The sequence between cause and effect in these two statements is undoubtedly obvious to the practised eye, but the untutored American mind could get the hang of it better if it were accompanied by a diagram.

The appalling catastrophe at Pittston, Pennsylvania, again calls attention to the cruelty of the miners' position in the industrial world. It would be only natural to suppose that the Pennsylvania coal miner, who takes his life in his hand every time he enters a mine, would receive a rate of pay commensurate with the awful risk he is asked to undergo. Labor statistics, however, show that the miner is the poorest paid laborer on earth, and that although he risks his life daily, in many instances from the cradle to the grave, he never has a dollar that he can truthfully call his own.

THE CRETAN SETTLEMENT.

The Sultan has appointed a Christian—the Prince of Samos—to the Governorship of Crete, and it is thought that this step may end the Cretan disturbances. The Armenian troubles could have been ended with much less humiliation for the Turkish Government than that. The Cretans were rebellious and dangerous. They had arms, and they were not afraid to use, and they had to be pacified, either by extermination or by concessions. As they were members of the Greek Church, and hence co-religionists, not only of the Greeks, but of the Russians, it might have been dangerous to exterminate them. Hence Turkey has pacified them by giving them a Governor of their own faith.

In the case of the Armenians, nothing of that sort would have been necessary. They were not in insurrection; they had no need to be pacified. They asked nothing but their lives. All the Sultan would have had to do to restore peace to Armenia would have been to revoke the programme of outrage, torture and slaughter that he himself had laid down. But the Armenians had no powerful friends in the Christian world. Russia regarded them as heretical, and England, which had formerly prevented their rescue from Turkish rule, on a solemn pledge to protect their rights, found that it would be inconvenient and expensive to keep her promise. Hence the Armenians remain in hell, with every prospect of staying there until the race is

extinct, or until some other course upsets the rotten fabric of Turkish dominion.

It is almost a pity that the Cretan trouble has been settled. It looked as if Crete might be the fuse destined to explode the stack of dynamite piled in the Ottoman cellar, and that would have been a result worth some temporary suffering.

THE ORACLE AT LAST.

The Sphinx of Canton has spoken, but it cannot be said that the world is much wiser than it was before. When Mr. McKinley announced that he had fixed upon yesterday as the time for the definite announcement of his views on the financial question, the public supposed that at last it would have an unequivocal statement that would constitute, in the technicalities of politics, "the keynote of the campaign." But surely no political musician ever struck a feebler or more uncertain keynote than that sounded yesterday by Mr. McKinley when he received the unexpected news of his nomination.

There was evidently a concerted effort between the Notification Committee and the candidate to obscure the financial question and push the tariff to the front. Senator Thurston, the chairman of the committee, spoke to the extent of five hundred words, of which only six were devoted to money, and they formed an incidental reference buried in a sentence about more important matters. And those six words gave no information. "Sound money" and "honest finance"—that is absolutely all. Not a word to indicate what sound money and honest finance may happen to be. There is not a Populist or a mine owner in America who would refuse to subscribe to that creed.

The candidate was more diffuse, but hardly more definite. He devoted about a thousand words to the tariff, intimating that if we made the taxes high enough our financial difficulties would settle themselves. In the midst of this ramble through the bat-haunted caves of dead issues he paused to repeat lovingly his cherished bit of patter from his Lincoln speech and his Ohio platform: "The American people hold the financial honor of our Government as sacred as our flag, and can be relied upon to guard it with the same sleepless vigilance." Of course Teller would agree to that, or Altgeld, or Peffer, or Tillman. They all hold the financial honor of the Government as sacred as its flag. What the public would like to know is wherein Mr. McKinley's ideas of financial honor differ from theirs.

On that point he gives us little precise information. He tells us, it is true, that "the money of the United States, and every kind of form of it, whether of paper, silver or gold, must be as good as the best in the world." But that is precisely what the silver men say would happen if we had free coinage, and Mr. McKinley does not say it would not.

For a statesman who has made a specialty of the tariff—who hardly pretends to know anything else—the Napoleon of Protection is astonishingly ill-informed about the most elementary facts concerning the workings of customs laws. After eleven days for reflection he has repeated and elaborated the silly assertion of the Republican platform that the new tariff has "forced an adverse balance of trade." As Mr. McKinley puts it: "If we would restore . . . the policy by which we made and bought more goods at home and gold more abroad, the trade balance would be quickly turned in our favor, and gold would come to us, and not go from us, in the settlement of all such balances in the future."

Now, the simple fact is that when the McKinley tariff was at the height of its glory, in the fiscal year 1892-93, there was an "adverse balance of trade" of \$18,735,725. The following year, when the shadow of tariff reform was darkening the land, the balance turned in our favor to the extent of \$237,145,950. The next year, when the low tariff had become an accomplished fact, we sold abroad \$75,563,200 worth of goods more than we bought. Finally, for the first nine months of the present fiscal year, the excess of exports was \$70,490,544. We have had what protectionists call a "favorable balance of trade" ever since the low tariff was enacted, and it was only under McKinleyism that we had anything else. The American people may say to Mr. McKinley, as the English statesman said to the King-at-Arms who made a blunder in heraldry: "You don't even understand your own foolish business." And if the Advance Agent of Prosperity does not even understand his foolish tariff specialty, what are we to expect of him in the mazes of the financial problem?

MR. HARVEY'S GREAT SCHEME.

Mr. "Coin" Harvey has evolved a gorgeous plan for harmonizing the conflicting ambitions of the various parties that are expected to fight for free silver in the coming campaign. He proposes that they shall put the Presidency in commission, and give every free coinage faction a share of its spoils. The Democracy is to have the nominal Presidency, but Mr. Harvey is good enough to save the Convention the trouble of selecting him. He has picked out Mr. Bland for the

honor. President Bland is to have the privilege of appointing one Cabinet officer—the Secretary of State. As the Secretary of State has practically no patronage (almost all the offices in his department being filled by permanent tenure), the Democracy would thus be relieved at once of all suspicions of sordid place-seeking. For the first time a Democratic President would be free from the importunities of office-hunters.

For the Vice-Presidency Mr. Harvey has selected Senator Marion Butler, of North Carolina, who is to be nominated by the Populists and endorsed by the Democrats. Mr. Butler is to have the privilege of appointing the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, War and the Navy. He will thus be a considerably bigger man than the President. As there are not enough Presidents and Vice-Presidents to go around, Mr. Harvey proposes to provide for the silver Republicans by giving them three members of the Cabinet named in advance. Senator Teller is to be Secretary of the Treasury, Judge Caldwell Attorney-General, and Mayor Pingree, of Detroit, Postmaster-General.

By this arrangement it is calculated that the votes of eight States will be secured to the combination, because the friends of every man slated for a Cabinet office will vote for the ticket. But Mr. Harvey has made one fatal oversight. He has forgotten the friends of the several times eight statesmen who want to be Cabinet officers, and whom his plan would deprive of hope in advance. It is a political axiom that every office distributed makes nine enemies and one ingrate. Experienced politicians are always careful to defer this operation until after the returns are canvassed. A party that distributed its offices before election would hardly be heard from in the balloting. Mr. Harvey will know more about politics when he is older.

MAYOR GLEASON'S MISTAKE.

We cannot resist the feeling that Mayor Gleason, of Long Island City, has been hasty in degrading his valet to the stable on account of a mistake in the niceties of dress. According to the version of a usually accurate contemporary, the difficulty arose over the question whether russet shoes and a red satin four-in-hand, with the ends tucked into the front of the shirt between the two diamond studs, were appropriate accompaniments for evening dress. It seems that the faithful attendant had taken the Mayor's patent leather shoes to New York to have a patch put over the toe, and the lawn necktie with the forget-me-nots embroidered on the ends was at the laundry.

In these exigent circumstances what was to be done? Some may say that a special messenger should have been summoned to retrieve the shoes at any cost, and that another should have hid him to the laundry and there personally have secured the forget-me-not-adorned lawn necktie. But all that would have required time, and there was no time to spare. The Mayor had ordered his habilliments to be prepared "within the hour." The only thing to do was to build with the materials at hand.

The russet shoes and red satin necktie may have been a little striking, but what of that? Mayor Gleason is striking himself. Nobody can deny the eminent appropriateness of the combination, and appropriateness is of the essence of correctness in style. Besides, all fashions have to be set by somebody. The Prince of Wales could wear a red satin necktie with a dress suit to-morrow, and the next day every fashionable assembly would look like a field of peonies. There is no man better qualified, by the distinction of his manner and the originality of his conceptions, to set the fashions than Mayor Gleason, and it is a pity that he allowed the spontaneous genius of his resourceful valet to be crushed by the unbending rules of a pedantic conventionalism.

The Spanish troops in Cuba captured three rebel camps on Saturday, and it was not a very good day for camps either. If they could only capture a few rebels at the same time, the happiness of the Spanish commander would be complete.

No, the correspondent who asks whether the expression "is to" means that there are sixteen silver candidates for the Democratic nomination to one gold one is not correct. The sixteen silver candidates are all right, but the gold aspirant is not in sight.

The reference in the Republican platform to the desirability of "buying the Danish Islands in the West Indies" is said to have created a sensation in Denmark, whose people think their Government would be willing to sell at a reasonable price. This is one feature of the Republican programme upon which there ought to be no difference of opinion in this country. We have no desire to crowd any country out of its possessions, but we need the West Indies, and when a European nation that is established there wants to get out, as Denmark has wanted to do for the past thirty years, we ought to offer it every facility for doing so. There is nothing like seizing the favorable moment. The time might come when we might like to have the Danish Islands, and Denmark might not feel like selling.

THE BATTLE OF THE STANDARDS.

Twenty-five years ago the owner of a bar of silver bullion could take it to any mint in the United States, in India, or on the continent of Europe, except in Portugal, and have it coined into full standard money, which he could use for paying his debts or taxes, or for buying anything he might need. To-day he has not that privilege in any of those countries. Twenty-five years ago the silver dollar was worth \$1.03 in gold. To-day it is worth 53 cents. The question at issue in the present campaign is whether the United States ought to try to restore silver to the position it held in 1871, and if so, whether it can do so without the help of the other countries whose mints were open then. To throw light upon this question the Journal has asked some of the leading authorities upon both sides to state their opinions, and the reasons for them, and their responses will be published from day to day.

There are certain points upon which all agree. All want "sound money." A correspondent writes to the Journal asking pathetically what sound money is. He says that he has never been able to pass an English sovereign in the United States, an American five-dollar gold piece abroad, or a coin of any country, of any metal, outside of the jurisdiction of the government that issued it. It will be the object of each of the participants in the Journal's symposium to show why the kind of money he favors is the only kind that can truthfully be described as sound.

All want a kind of money that varies as little as possible in value from year to year and from decade to decade. If a debtor can pay what he owes in money that is worth less than that he borrowed his creditors are cheated. If he can be compelled to pay a kind of money that is worth more than the kind he borrowed his creditors cheat him. The advocates of the gold standard say that the silver dollar is a dishonest dollar because it is worth only 53 cents in gold. The advocates of the double standard say that the gold dollar is a dishonest dollar because it is worth \$1.88 in silver. Whether the silver dollar has gone down in the past quarter of a century or the gold dollar has gone up is the point about which a great part of the present controversy rages.

The experiment which the free silver men wish us to try is at once new and old. It is old because we always had the free coinage of silver before

Silver.

Richard Parks Bland, who opens the discussion on the silver side, was the author of the first free coinage bill that passed the House after the demonetization of silver, and is the favorite candidate of the extreme free silver element for the Presidency.

In an article on the Democratic party and the currency, in the North American Review for April, 1896, page 492, I used the following language: "It is difficult to see how any more compromises can be had on the question of currency; especially will it be difficult to reconcile the conflict between the demand for total demonetization of silver and its unconditional restoration. When the question is again pressed forward it is difficult to see how there can be any other solution—the total abandonment of silver or its restoration to its constitutional privileges at our mints. The special plea to await the concurrence of other nations can no longer be entertained. The last international conference at Brussels developed the fact that there is no probability of any agreement on this question."

"The time has come when our sixty-five or seventy millions of people must act independently. No limping or stilted standard such as we now have can long survive. Silver is either a safe money metal or it is not. If it is not suitable for free coinage it ought not to be further coined. If it is suitable for coinage at all, it ought not to be debased by limiting its coinage. "It is fair to assume that the Democratic party will still oppose national banks, that this party will not tolerate the increase and manipulation of the public debt for the purpose of turning over or farming out our system of money to banks of issue. If so, the logical result is to look to silver and gold to take the place of bank issues. Gold is not sufficient to answer the purpose, hence silver must and will continue to constitute our supply to meet the great demands made for money by our vastly increasing business and population."

Subsequent events seem to bear out the predictions above made—every proposition presented to the Democratic House of Representatives in past Congresses, and especially in the Fifty-third Congress, when the Carlisle bill was presented as a solution of our difficulties upon the currency question, the Democrats overwhelmingly defeating it and all propositions for the extension and continuation of the National banking system. From the commencement, in the history of the Democratic party, up to the present time, there has been unbroken, determined opposition to the Hamiltonian theory of currency based upon national banks. Jefferson opposed the National banking system, and in his opposition to this system his writings upon that subject laid down the broad basis of democratic government, the rights, powers and dignities of the States, opposition to the encroachment of Federal power, and especially that power employed in Federal monopolies, among which the national banking system was denounced by him as the most dangerous to the welfare and liberties of the people. This opposition was continued in Democratic administrations and especially in that of Jackson. Indeed, it became and is to-day one of the principal tenets of Democratic faith. Mr. Carlisle and the Administration, when appealing to the Democrats to foster and maintain a national banking system, were asking the members of that party to stultify the record made by the party for a century past. That such an appeal met with stubborn opposition and overwhelming defeat proves how steadily the Democratic party holds to ancient principles and established Democratic landmarks. The contest heretofore has been, as respects our monetary system, a contest between the advocates of national banks, or credit money issues, and the advocates of the maintenance of our ancient bimetallic law.

The purpose in this country and Western Europe to eliminate silver as standard money and to rest the measure of value on gold alone originated with banking corporations, with a view of forcing their credit issues upon the people as a substitute for full legal tender money. The demonetization of silver has thus been brought about by the rich, powerful corporations interested in securing to themselves the enormous profits involved in supplying the people with money, the profit on the issues of which would accrue to the corporations issuing it instead of to the people of government. The great power to-day in this and other countries arrayed against the restoration of silver comes from national banks and kindred institutions, over which they have control. The full restoration of silver to eliminate silver as standard money is not being demanded—first, because the people are not willing that gold alone shall constitute the only money of final redemption; second, because even both gold and silver linked together as full legal tender money would not maintain prices at a greater level than would be necessary to guarantee profit to productive enterprises or secure prosperity to our country. It is not seriously contended even by the gold standardists that the people of our country have been, or is likely to be, sufficient for the needs of commerce and as a medium of exchange. This scarcity of gold is shown

Gold.

Wheeler H. Peckham, the first distinguished member of the New York Bar, whose enthusiastic work for the Cleveland faction of the Democracy gave him a national reputation and provoked Senator Hill to prevent his confirmation as a Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. Whitney inspiring, the New York Democratic Convention resolves that bimetalism is desirable; that it can be attained only by international co-operation; that the present tendency of thought in Europe is toward such international co-operation; that attempt by the United States alone to adopt the free coinage of silver would result only in the establishment of silver monometallism; that such attempt would be exceedingly unwise, and that the true course for the Democratic party is to favor international bimetalism, and until that is secured to maintain the existing gold standard.

Mr. Whitney and those acting with him are delegates to the Chicago Convention, and intend to urge upon it the adoption of their views as a compromise between free silver coinage on the one hand and gold monometallism on the other.

Now, suppose that Mr. Whitney falls, as he probably will, and that a free silver platform is adopted, and a free silver candidate is nominated.

What, under such circumstances, should a gold Democrat do? What does good faith to his party and good faith to his country require him to do?

If the subject matter of difference were comparatively unimportant—if other questions of primary importance were pending, it might well be that personal views or other questions should be subordinated to attainment of success on the more important.

If, however, the issue on which divergence exists is of transcendent importance; if it be the one issue to which the minds of all men are directed; if it be one which for years has challenged and received the most active and affirmative attention of the people; which has enlisted in its discussion the ablest men; which has engrossed the columns of the most prominent and competent newspapers; which has permeated all ranks of society, from the most educated thinkers, the men of the largest experience in the business of the world and the practical affairs of life, the workmen who bear upon their shoulders the burden of the physical labor of the world, down to the tramp who, for a living, walks the highways; which is international also in character, and interests our brethren the world over almost as much as it interests us at home—if, it is submitted, the issue be of that character, is it not almost childish to say that the decision of any convention should have any weight with any man in or out of it who does not accord with his own deliberate convictions?

The silver question is a very simple one—simple and plain to the last degree. The fact that many and very able men have differed about it proves nothing to the contrary. There never was a question so simple as not to have two sides, where there were two interests or conflicting passions. There is nothing more incredible than many things in which millions of men have the most absolute belief.

The question of money or currency is this: For a community to get beyond barter it must have something of exchangeable as distinguished from, though including, intrinsic value fitted to express in terms of its own the relative exchangeable value of other things.

The most important element of that something, in order to fulfil its function, is stability of value, i. e., stability of cost of production and of demand. Gold has and now does more nearly constitute that something than anything else.

By referring the exchangeable value of all commodities to their relative value to gold, and using gold to pay differences, we facilitate exchanges and business which, without it or some substitute, would be impossible.

Now, that is all we want of money. No one wants money for itself. We want it for exchanges. The most wealthy men generally have and use the least money. Their exchanges are made with reference to money and its relative value to commodities, but credits of various kinds are what they actually use.

Now, of all the qualities of money, that of its relative value to commodities is of the least importance, provided that it is within the bounds of reasonable convenience.

The free coinage men complain that gold is so valuable that prices expressed in gold are low.

Well, what matter? If the relative value is only constant so far as the gold is concerned, it makes not the slightest difference whether the price is high or low. The gold value being constant, the prices of all commodities are affected alike. If the price of any one commodity varies, it must be owing to something affecting that commodity, say steel rails, which have greatly lessened in price owing to the Bessemer process. Now that gold is well adapted to perform the functions of money

is surely proved by the fact that it has been so generally, and especially by the more advanced nations, adopted for that purpose. That it well performs the functions of money for us to-day is shown by the enormous trade we carry on without friction or difficulty.

No case can be pointed out during the past of our country where any transaction in trade has been prevented or impeded for lack of money, and gold money, in which to make it, except in cases of panic. No man ever had or has anything to sell and a buyer to buy at a price who was prevented from selling by the lack of currency, unless pending a panic, which is affected by other considerations.

Money, then, being the commodity by which to measure and in which to express the relative value of all commodities, how can we have two commodities like gold and silver to serve that purpose? A moment's thought shows that it is impossible. If commercial value is in mind, unless a ratio is found which shall remain constant, it is apparent that we shall have two measures, and, as debts will always be paid in the less valuable, the other will go out of circulation.

This law is universal not only in theory but in fact. It has been repeatedly recognized by our Government. The Currency Committee of Congress in its report of February 2, 1881, said of the mint ratio established by Hamilton: "It is sufficient to know by unhappy experience that its tendency is to rid us of a gold currency and leave us nothing but silver."

Secretary Ingham, May 4, 1880, in response to a Senate resolution of inquiry said: "The history of coinage proves that little reliance can be placed on artificial regulations of relative values of the standard measure of property as a means of maintaining a regular currency of uniform value. . . . The proposition that there can be but one standard, in fact, is self-evident. . . . The history of nations abounds with laws and regulations to keep gold and silver together and statutes prohibiting under severe penalties the exportation of either; all of which have disappointed every expectation of their projectors."

Mr. C. P. Whitney's select committee of the House on coins said in a report, June 30, 1892: "The committee cannot ascertain that both metals have ever circulated simultaneously and concurrently and indiscriminately in any country where there are banks or money dealers."

Mr. Benton said in the Senate that everybody knew that gold was undervalued and "expelled from circulation."

In the House in 1872, when at the existing ratio silver was the more valuable, Judge Kelley said: "It has become impossible to secure an American dollar in this country except in collections of curiosities." Mr. Hooper said that the silver dollar "has long since ceased to be a coin of circulation," and that the committee had concluded that "the gold dollar should be declared the money unit."

The Latin Union, formed in 1892 to sustain the free coinage of both metals, had to restrict the coinage of silver in 1874 and to suspend it in 1878.

The double standard, then, is a self-evident absurdity, and there is and can be no real controversy as between the double and single standards. Enact what law you will, the more valuable metal at the prescribed ratio will go out of circulation.

The silver men understand the law as well as the gold men, and the real issue is not as between double and single standard, but as between gold and silver standard.

Change to a silver standard can benefit but two classes of persons:

1. The producers and owners of silver. They would temporarily be benefited by a larger demand. So soon, however, as that demand was supplied the benefit would cease.

2. The debtors owing money. If they survived the panic that would immediately and temporarily follow the change, would be able to pay their existing debts for about fifty cents on the dollar. After the perpetration of that fraud the benefit to them would cease.

On the other hand the injury to the whole community would be incalculable. Every salary would be worth but half its nominal amount. Every dollar in a savings bank would be paid with fifty cents.

All the long debt bonds of corporations, whether railroad or otherwise, would either be paid in gold, according to their terms, thus absorbing for that purpose twice the proportionate earnings of the company, or would be paid in silver, thus reducing by one-half the value of the securities of those who had been induced to invest in them.

Wages, which affect the vast mass of the people, would be reduced to one-half their present value, and the necessities would change first; misery to the laborer would follow.

And now, to enlarge the catalogue of consequences with which every thinking man is familiar:

The only thing of importance is that we should not deceive ourselves.

The issue is not bimetalism. Bimetalism is a dream, a chimera, an absurdity.

The real issue is gold or silver. It is upon us. The silver champions are bold, aggressive. They should be met, and the battle fought out.

They who seek the silver standard for their own selfish purpose should be crushed, and they who follow them in the speculative notion that in silver they have found a sort of philosopher's stone or Keely motor must be found, and that to use it honestly, no more now than at any time in the past, is a manly way to lift himself up by his boot straps.

W. R. Hearst

Wheeler H. Peckham